

## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent Office Washington, D.C. 20231

Address Only: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS

Paper No.

P ART HMIT

		In Reply Please Refer To	The Following:	Maileo	Mailed	
EXA NAM	MINER'S IE	J. Tovar				
12		02/27/79	015,752		MAILEU	
GR. A	ART UN.	FILING DATE	SERIAL NO.		MACIETY	
	No:	rbert Busch et			FEB 26 1960	
E.		OF N-PROPANOL A	INVENTION MINE		GROUP 120	
Ha	selti	ne. Lake & Wate	rs	Below is a communication	on from the EXAMINER	
122	2 Eas	ne, Lake & Wate t 42ND St. k. N. Y. 10017			er of Patents.	
L	w 1011	k, N. 1. 1001/			<del></del>	
			ADVISORY ACT	TION .		
X	THE PE	RIOD FOR RESPONSE IS	S EXTENDED TO RUN	——————————————————————————————————————	THE DATE OF THE FINA	
一	REJECT	<u>REJECTION.</u> 855 O. G. 1109.				
ш	Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with Rule 192(a).  Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed					
	effect, b	effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:				
1	The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:					
	<ul> <li>a.</li></ul>					
	е. 📋	They present additional ch	aims without cancelling a cor	responding number of finally rejec	ted claims.	
2.		proposed or amended clain ment cancelling the non-allo	ns	would be allowed if sub	mitted in a separately filed	
• M						
3.₩Д	Upon the filing of an appeal, the proposed amendment will be will not be, entered and the status of the claims in this application would be as follows:					
	a. 🔲 (	Claims		would be allowable.		
	ь. 📈 і	Claims	8	would not be allowable.	me as in	
		However:		7	-n p)	
		(1) The rejection of cla response.	aims	on references is deemed to be o	vercome by applicant's	
		(2) The rejection of cla by applicant's respo	ims onse.	on non-reference grounds only	is deemed to be overcome	
4.	The affi	davit, exhibit or request fo	or reconsideration has been er	ntered but does not overcome the i	ejection.	
5.	The affidavit or exhibit will not be admitted because applicant has not shown good and spfficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.					
6.	amendm	lication having been examin nent has not been conside ondition for appeal.	ned under the special accelera red since it does not prima fa -	ted examining procedure (M.P.E.P cie place the application in condit	2. 708.02), the proposed ion for allowance or in	